

EXHIBIT 14

3

4

5 ePlus, Inc.,

6 Plaintiff,

7 versus 309 CV 620

8 Lawson Software, Inc.

9 Defendant

10

11

12

13 before: HONORABLE ROBERT E. PAYNE
Senior United States District Judge

14

15

16 August 10, 2010
Richmond, Virginia

17

18

19 Phone Conference

20

21

25

1 cetera. I haven't heard word one, so I am
2 deciding you decided to ride the horses you
3 have got.

4 MR. McDONALD: No, we are planning on
5 using additional experts. We have been in
6 negotiations with ePlus on an agreed time table
7 for the service of the report and the
8 depositions to get them all done before the
9 trial. I think we are going to be successful
10 with that.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. ROBERTSON: This is Mr. Robertson. We
13 didn't agree on a time table, Dan, let's be
14 fair. We had a discussion about it yesterday.

15 THE COURT: Wait a minute, Mr. Robertson.
16 He said, we were working with you. He didn't
17 say -- and he said, I think we will be
18 successful. You are saying you don't think you
19 will be. That is a different animal. But he
20 didn't say you reached an agreement.

21 MR. ROBERTSON: You are accurate, Your
22 Honor. Absolutely.

23 Obviously we would like to know who the
24 additional experts are as soon as possible. We
25 would like to get a disclosure from and take

1 their deposition in a meaningful way before
2 trial. The proposal has been made that they
3 would give us, identify their validity expert
4 by tomorrow. They don't know when they would
5 identify the source code expert they are
6 aspiring to get and giving us a report. We go
7 from August 25 and produce the witnesses for
8 deposition August -- the week of August 30.

9 THE COURT: Does that suit you?

10 MR. McDONALD: That would suit me if we
11 could get that time. I might have,
12 obviously -- two concerns I have. I mean, it
13 is their burden on invalidity. I would like to
14 be able to, obviously, respond to that. So
15 that actually puts me in a tighter bind.
16 Secondly, I assume the spirit and letter of The
17 Court's scheduling order on the two disciplines
18 that what was not contemplated is that they get
19 to call another expert to get up and say, I
20 agree with Dr. Shamos.

21 THE COURT: No, no. They can't do that.

22 MR. McDONALD: Secondly, I would think
23 your ruling on that, they are confined to the
24 second supplemental statement, means they still
25 can't go outside of that with respect to